



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/785,326	02/24/2004	Fredric J. Cohen	X-11057C	9685	
25885 7.	590 02/24/2006		EXAMINER		
ELI LILLY & COMPANY			DELACROIX MUIRHE, CYBILLE		
PATENT DIVI P.O. BOX 6288			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288			1614		

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/785,326	COHEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid	1614		

	Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid	1614					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the same of the sam	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).	· ·	ILLD WITTING				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2. ⊠ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 <i>January 2006</i>. A br</u>	iof in compliance with 27 CER 44 2	7 must be filed within	hus months of				
the Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 <u>January 2006</u> . A bit the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	11.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the				
	hut prior to the data of filing a brief	Will not be entered by					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, if (a) They raise new issues that would require further continuous (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below). 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>145,146,149 and 150</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 147,148,151 and 152. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)loshs	Som				
		CHRISTOPHER S. F. L SUPERVISORY PATENT EX TECHNOLOGY CENTER	OW AMINER 1600				

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the previous claim rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Arbuthnot et al., 6,458,811 (rejection is withdrawn pursuant to 35 USC 103(c)) and the previous double patenting rejection over USPN 6,458,811, both rejections set forth in paragraphs 3-4 of the office action mailed Sep. 22, 2004.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's amendment deleting "de novo" and adding --in the first instance-- does not overcome the previous rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph (paragraph 1 of the office action mailed July 28, 2005). Such an amendment is a rewording of the claims, for upon reference to the specification page 6, lines 30-31, it is clear that "in the first instance" is another way of describing "primary prevention". Therefore the rejection is maintained for reasons already of record.